

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

JASON LEE ANDERSON, #02223281,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:24-cv-240-JDK-KNM
	§	
CAROL MONROE,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Jason Lee Anderson, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brings this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636.

On September 16, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court dismiss this case with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b) and 1915(e)(2). Docket No. 11. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff’s claims—concerning how Defendant is a member of the “Illuminati” and showed him a dream—were fanciful and factually frivolous. Plaintiff objected. Docket No. 13.

Where a party timely objects to the Report and Recommendation, the Court reviews the objected-to findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire

record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Plaintiff’s objections are difficult to decipher. He states that the Magistrate Judge’s Report makes him “look crazy,” and that his claims are not fantastical—as the Defendant “got on me in 2018 and showed me all this in my dream.” Docket No. 13 at 1.

The Court determines, however, that Plaintiff’s objections confirm the accuracy of the Magistrate Judge’s Report: Plaintiff’s claims are factually frivolous and fanciful. *See, e.g., Starrett v. United States Dep’t of Def.*, 763 F. App’x 383, 383–44 (5th Cir. 2019) (affirming dismissal of “outlandish claims of near-constant surveillance, theft of intellectual property, and painful remote communication accomplished using nonexistent technology” because the “pleaded facts are facially implausible”). Plaintiff’s allegations that the Defendant showed him a dream is indeed fanciful, and the objections are therefore overruled.

Having conducted a de novo review of the record in this case and the Magistrate Judge’s Report, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct, and Plaintiff’s objections are without merit. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 11) as the opinion of the District Court. Plaintiff’s claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b) and 1915(e)(2).

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 13th day of **February, 2025**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeremy D. Kernodle", is written over a horizontal line.

JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE